



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,424	12/21/2000	Armando Paul Stettner	005217.P022	1478

33318 7590 06/23/2005

DIGEO, INC.
8815 122ND NE
KIRKLAND, WA 98033

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/747,424	Applicant(s) STETTNER, ARMANDO PAUL	
	Examiner Vivek Srivastava	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2005.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 12, 14 – 21 and 34 – 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levitan (5,864,823) in view of Toader (5,806,043) and Kikinis (5,929,849).

Regarding claims 1 and 15, Levitan discloses a method, system and article of manufacture for linking a customer to a merchant of advertiser, wherein the user or customer can request "more information" after viewing a advertisement enabling a direct link to the advertiser via the Internet (see col 7 lines 12 – 42). It is noted that since the user can communicate directly with the advertisers and compose and orders for products from the advertisers (see col 7 lines 12 – 42), Levitan disclose the claimed

identifying customer information from the detected response, correlating the identified customer information to merchant information (advertisers web page) and triggering notification of the identified specific advertiser to allow communication between the user and specific advertiser.

Levitan discloses a server 18 which servers a plurality of client customer devices 16 (see fig 2). Levitan fails to disclose sending the response to the interactive advertisement to a server, wherein the server is capable to identify customer information from the detected response and a storage unit coupled to the server to store customer information and merchant information, the server coupled to access the storage unit to correlate the identified customer information to merchant information stored therein to identify a specific merchant and communication device coupled to the server to trigger a notification of the identified specific merchant to allow communication between the customer and the specific merchant.

Toader teaches an interactive user-vendor system which users a Internet entry server for hot-linking the customer to the sponsor's/vendors internet domain page (see col 2 lines 26 – 38). It would have been obvious to modify Levitan to include a server for performing linking the customer to the advertiser to enable a single server for identifying the customer response, storing the customer information and merchant information and communicating a trigger notification to trigger a notification of the identified merchant to reduce the hardware/software associated with a storage device and communication device at the customer site. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Levitan to include the claimed limitations

to minimize the costs, hardware and software associated with a storage device and communication device at the customer site needed for linking the customer to the plurality of merchants.

The combination of Levitan and Toader fails to teach the claimed while the customer is viewing the interactive advertisement is within a broadcast segment. Kikinis teaches a system and method which provides interactive commercials within a television broadcast (see col 6 lines 23 – 63, col 8 lines 23 – 53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Levitan and Toader to include the claimed limitation to provide interaction and linking to vendor's and sponsors while the user is viewing commercials within a television broadcast segment as well as the COD as taught by the combination of Levitan and Toader.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Levitan discloses the claimed interactive video casting and interactive television system (see col 5 lines 35 – 46, fig 3).

Regarding claim 4, Levitan discloses recipient's or customers name and email address (see col 3 lines 30 – 35) or "ID code".

Regarding claims 5 and 6, the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis fails to disclose correlating a characteristic associated with the interactive advertisement to the merchant information wherein the characteristic associated comprises one of a channel in which the interactive advertisement was provided, a time in which the interactive advertisement was provided, or a time in which the customer responded to the interactive advertisement.

The Examiner takes Official Notice it would have been well known to correlate the channel in which the advertisement was watched with an address to provide important statistical or marketing information to a advertiser or vendor. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis to include the claimed limitation to provide an advertiser or vendor with important statistical or marketing information.

Regarding claim 7, Levitan discloses a video clip (see col 7 lines 13 – 16).

Regarding claims 8 and 18, the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis fails to disclose wherein the interactive advertisement is capable of being provided via a telephone, and wherein the instructions to identify customer information from the detected response comprise audio processing instructions to identify words spoken by the customer into a telephone set as part of the response.

The Examiner takes Official Notice provide and advertisement via telephone would have been a well known means for providing advertising over a well-established well-connected infrastructure. Further, the Examiner takes Official Notice that audio processing a response by a user to identify words spoken by a customer into a telephone is well known means for a user to conveniently enter or provide information without having to physically enter the information by hand i.e. keyboard or remote control. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis to include the claimed limitation to provide advertising over a well

known- well-established infrastructure while conveniently processing user response information without having the user to physically enter the information.

Regarding claims 9 and 19 Levitan discloses composing an pre-order or “completing a pre-order template” include customer’s name, customer’s address and merchant’s or advertiser’s e-mail address or “merchant information” (see col 3 lines 30 – 35). It is noted that the template must be received and processed before the order can be complete. Thus Levitan discloses the claimed pre-order template.

Regarding claim 10, Levitan discloses triggering notification and communication between the specific merchant via email (see col 3 lines 25 – 43) and thus also discloses the claimed “email device”.

Regarding claims 11 and 21, Levitan discloses displaying a link or “trigger”, which is transmitted with the advertisement, enabling a customer to select the link for direct communication link between the customer and advertiser (see col 7 lines 29 – 43).

Regarding claims 12 and 20, Levitan discloses the claimed interactive video casting system (see col 5 lines 35 – 45 and col 3 lines 25 – 45) and instructions inherently included for displaying “more information” or a link to the advertisers web page (see col 7 lines 24 – 43). It is noted that instructions are inherently included to detect customer activation to the indicator since the user can access the advertiser’s web page.

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis discloses the claimed limitation, wherein Toader discloses the claimed communication (see col 1 lines 15 – 27, col 6 lines 1- 18).

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis disclose the claimed limitation, wherein Toader discloses hot-linking the customer to the vendor which would include identifying an identification code corresponding to the client or customer terminal (see col 2 lines 26 – 40).

Regarding claim 17, Levitan discloses a link which inherently comprises an address meeting the claimed “correlate a characteristic associated with the interactive advertisement to the merchant information” (see col 7 lines 24 – 43).

Regarding claims 34 – 35, the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis discloses the claimed limitation, wherein Kikinis disclose a visual indicator that the advertisement is interactive (fig 2A item 57, col 6 lines 50 – 63, col 7 lines 18 – lines 67).

Regarding claim 36, the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis fails to disclose the claimed audio indicator. Official Notice is taken a means for alerting or indication by audio is a well known means for quickly alerting a user or getting a user’s attention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Levitan, Toader and Kikinis to include the claimed limitation to quickly alert the user that interactive content is present.

Claims 22 - 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levitan (5,864,823) in view of Toader (5,806,043).

Regarding claim 22 Levitan discloses a method, system and article of manufacture for linking a customer to a merchant of advertiser, wherein the user or customer can request "more information" after viewing a advertisement enabling a direct link to the advertiser via the Internet (see col 7 lines 12 – 42). It is noted that since the user can communicate directly with the advertisers and compose and orders for products from the advertisers (see col 7 lines 12 – 42), Levitan disclose the claimed identifying customer information from the detected response, correlating the identified customer information to merchant information (advertisers web page) and triggering notification of the identified specific advertiser to allow communication between the user and specific advertiser.

Levitan discloses a server 18 which servers a plurality of client customer devices 16 (see fig 2). Levitan fails to disclose sending the response to the interactive advertisement to a server, wherein the server is capable to identify customer information from the detected response and a storage unit coupled to the server to store customer information and merchant information, the server coupled to access the storage unit to correlate the identified customer information to merchant information stored therein to identify a specific merchant and communication device coupled to the server to trigger a notification of the identified specific merchant to allow automatic communication between the customer and the specific merchant.

Toader teaches an interactive user-vendor system which users a Internet entry server for automatically hot-linking the customer to the sponsor's/vendors internet domain page (see col 2 lines 26 – 38). It would have been obvious to modify Levitan to include a server for performing linking the customer to the advertiser to enable a single server for identifying the customer response, storing the customer information and merchant information and communicating a trigger notification to trigger a notification of the identified merchant to reduce the hardware/software associated with a storage device and communication device at the customer site. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Levitan to include the claimed limitations to minimize the costs, hardware and software associated with a storage device and communication device at the customer site needed for linking the customer to the plurality of merchants.

Regarding claim 23 Levitan discloses triggering notification and communication between the specific merchant via email (see col 3 lines 25 – 43) and thus also discloses the claimed “email device”.

Regarding claim 24 Levitan discloses composing an pre-order or “completing a pre-order template” include customer’s name, customer’s address and merchant’s or advertiser’s e-mail address or “merchant information” (see col 3 lines 30 – 35). It is noted that the template must be received and processed before the order can be complete. Thus Levitan discloses the claimed pre-order template.

Regarding claim 25, Levitan discloses an interactive video casting network coupleable to the server and capable to provide the interactive advertisement to the customer (see col 7 lines 13 – 43 and fig 2).

Regarding claim 26, Levitan discloses video equipment at both the server location and customer location for transmitting advertising video clips from the server to the customer. However, Levitan fails to disclose the claimed video equipment at both the customer's location and vendor location to facilitate communication.

In analogous art, Toader teaches an interactive user-vendor system which users a Internet entry server for automatically hot-linking the customer to the sponsor's/vendors internet domain page (see col 2 lines 26 – 38). Toader further teaches by hot-linking to the vendor's page, a customer can get product information (see col 2 lines 28 – 38). It would have been obvious to modify Levitan to include video equipment at both the customer and vendor location for the benefit of the user viewing product information which is more pleasing i.e. video format. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Levitan to include the claimed limitations to minimize the costs, hardware and software associated with a storage device and communication device at the customer site needed for linking the customer to the plurality of merchants and to provide a more pleasing depiction of product information which would be in video format.

Claims 13 and 27 – 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levitan in view of Toader and Kikinis as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of McCollom et al (6,343,274).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Levitan and Toader fails to disclose the claimed further comprising registering a plurality of merchants for interactive advertisements, including obtaining corresponding merchant information from the registered merchants.

McCollum discloses an interactive advertising system in which the merchants register for advertisement slots by entering required contractual information like identifying the merchant and categories for commercials etc. (see col 5 lines 30 – 63). It would have been obvious modifying the combination of Levitan and Toader to include the claimed limitation of registering the merchant would enable a more organized and secure means for scheduling advertisements to be sent while keeping track of the merchants providing advertisements. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the combination of Levitan and Toader to include the claimed limitation to provide a more organized and secure system for providing advertisements and to keep track of the merchants providing advertisements.

Regarding claim 27, the combination of Levitan, Toader Kikinis and McCollom discloses the claimed limitation, wherein Toader discloses the claimed wherein registering comprises registering a preferred method for automatically notifying the specific merchant when the customer response is detected (col 2 lines 27 – 40, col 4

lines 45 – 58), since live information is provide after meeting customer's questions, Toader teaches the claimed limitation.

Regarding claim 28, the combination of Levitan, Toader, Kikinis and McCollom discloses the claimed limitation, wherein Toader discloses the claimed registering a preferred method for notifying the specific merchant comprises registering a telephone number of the merchant that will be automatically called when the customer response is detected (col 4 lines 1 – 8).

Regarding claim 29, although Toader discloses notifying the merchant by telephone and email, the combination of Levitan, Toader, Kikinis and McCollom still fails to disclose automatically registering a facsimile number. Official Notice is taken in addition to telephone and email, the use of a facsimile is a conventional and effective means for conveying written information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Levitan, Toader, Kikinis and McCollum to include the claimed limitation to provide a conventional but effective way for registering and notifying a merchant when a customer's response is detected.

Regarding claim 30, the combination of Levitan, Toader, Kikinis and McCollom discloses the claimed limitation, wherein Toader discloses the claimed wherein registering a preferred method for notifying the specific merchant comprises registering an email address of the merchant to which an email message will be automatically sent when the customer response is detected (see col 1 lines 23 – 25, col 4 lines 40 – 67).

Regarding claims 31 and 32, the combination of Levitan, Toader, Kikinis and McCollom discloses the claimed limitation, wherein Toader discloses the claimed registering a preferred category of customers from which to receive responses and the claimed preferred category of customers comprises registering a category of customers from a particular geographic area (see col 4 lines 23 – 38, the claimed 'geographical area' is met by address).

Regarding claim 33, the combination of Levitan, Toader, Kikinis and McCollum fails to disclose the claimed wherein registering a preferred category of customers comprises registering a category of customers determined to be frequent shoppers of a particular product.

Official Notice is taken it well known to monitor a shopper's trends to determined what products are frequently purchased to customize or target advertisements relating to that product or other products closely related to the products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Levitan, Toader, Kikinis and McCollom to include the claimed limitation to provide tailored advertising to a user the providing a user with advertising which is more desirable.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Reimer et al (5,715,400) – Establishing links to merchants

Bezos et al (6,029,141) – Internet-based customer referral system

Wolff (6,247,047) – Computer network transactions


Shimomura et al (6,526,580) – Broadband data broadcasting service

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is (571) 272-7304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 9 am to 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272 – 7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vs
6/19/05


VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER